DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 284 EA 021 950

TITLE Improving Education: School Districts Implementing the Effective Schools Model. Committee Print Prepared for the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundred First Congress, Second Session, February 1990.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE Feb 90

NOTE 59p.; Report not officially adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor or pertinent subcommittee thereof. Serial No. 101-L.

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Educational Quality; *Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Excellence in Education; *Outcomes of Education; *School Effectiveness

IDENTIFIERS *Congress 101st

ABSTRACT

This preliminary staff report focuses on how nine individual school districts and one county education office implemented their own effective schools programs. The districts provided data in response to a committee questionnaire. The districts and lone county office were selected on the basis of how well their programs reflected the legislative definition of an effective schools project as defined in Chapter 2, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The districts and the lone county office successfully implemented their effective schools projects based on the following phenomena that either demonstrated or directly improved student outcomes: (1) higher competency test scores; (2) greater school-community collaboration in developing improvement plans; (3) increased outside technical assistance; (4) improved attendance and lowered dropout rates; and (5) structured implementation. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

IMPROVING EDUCATION: SCHOOL DISTRICTS IMPLEMENTING THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS MODEL

PREPARED FOR THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ED320284

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FEBRUARY 1990

THIS REPORT HAS NOT BEEN OFFICIALLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (OR PERTINENT SUBCOMMITTEE THEREOF) AND MAY NOT THEREFORE NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF ITS MEMBERS

Serial No. 101-L

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, *Chairman*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
26-758 ☆☆ WASHINGTON : 1990

For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

EA 021 950

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
NITA M. LOWEY, New York
GLENN POSHARD, Illinois
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
NICK JOE RAHALL, II, West Virginia
JAIME B. FUSTER, Puerto Rico
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JIM JONTZ, Indiana
KWEISI MFUME, Maryland

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER SMITH, Vermont
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas

PREFACE

February 1990.

School districts throughout the Nation are developing and implementing educational programs designed to improve teaching, learning and school management. One such improvement approach is the Effective Schools concept. Its major purpose, based on evolving research, is aimed at effectively teaching the school's curriculum to all of its students. This is accomplished by a school district's focusing on its unique needs, and on at least five characteristics which research shows to be present in schools that have been noted to be effective:

—strong instructional leadership
—a clear, focused mission
—a school climate which allows for high expectations for all students
—consistent and frequent monitoring of student progress
—a stable, orderly, and safe school environment

In addressing those unique needs, school districts have sought to achieve additional characteristics based on Effective Schools research. Among these characteristics are:

—strengthened home/school relations, and
—more time allocated to academic study

This report provides a description of how nine school districts and at least one county education office located in various parts of the country developed and implemented an Effective Schools program, based on their own definition of identified needs. They provided extensive data and other materials to committee staff, and Congressional Research Service staff. In this regard, Congressional Research Service assistance was invaluable to the committee in producing this report.

It is important that members of the Education and Labor Committee have access to this report in light of the inclusion of Effective Schools programs in the Hawkins/Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988. This report will also be useful to educators, interested citizens, and others in learning how a select number of school districts adopted school improvement methods based on the Effective Schools concept.

I believe that this report will be helpful in assisting the members of this committee in addressing avenues of Federal assistance in improving the Nation's schools, as part of the committee's oversight and legislative purpose.

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	III
Introduction	1
Caldwell (Idaho) Public School District	9
Clovis (California) Unified School District	12
Joliet (Illinois) School District #86	17
Kansas City Missouri School District	22
La Joya (Texas) Independent School District	26
Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania) Public School District	29
Prince George's County (Maryland) Public Schools	34
San Diego (California) County Office of Education	38
South Harrison (Missouri) Public School District	49
Spencerport (New York) Central School District	52

INTRODUCTION

The Congress of the United States recently enacted legislation directing Federal financial assistance to the implementation and expansion of educational projects based on the Effective Schools research. As defined in the legislation,[1] Effective Schools projects are intended to:

(1) promote school-level planning, instructional improvement, and staff development;

(2) increase the academic performance of all children, particularly those who are educationally deprived; and

(3) achieve certain characteristics in participating schools that are identified in the Effective Schools research.The characteristics which reportedly distinguish effective schools from others are:

(1) strong and effective instructional leadership;

(2) a focus on basic and higher order skills;

(3) a safe and orderly school environment;

(4) the expectation that nearly all children can learn; and

(5) ongoing assessment of student performance and program effectiveness.

In July 1987, the House Committee on Education and Labor issued a report entitled *Increasing Educational Success: The Effective Schools Model* (100th Congress, lst Session). That report included 3 detailed analyses of different aspects of the Effective Schools research and a selection of previously published articles and studies that form part of the Effective Schools research base.[2]

This current report provides a somewhat different perspective by focusing on how 9 individual school districts and 1 county education office are implementing their own Effective Schools programs. These districts and county office were selected for inclusion in this Committee print because their programs adhere closely to the definitions laid out in the Federal legislation. As the Effective Schools provisions in the new legislation are implemented, the prior experience of these and other school systems in establishing and carrying out Effective Schools programs will be important for determining how Federal assistance can best support districts in that process. In essence, the Committee asked these districts and county office to tell the "story" of their Effective Schools programs by completing a

[1] Chapter 2, Title I, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by P.L. 100-297, the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988. Chapter 2 is the Federal education block grant program. There are also Effective Schools provisions in Chapter 1 (compensatory education program) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act utilizing a nearly identical definition to that for Chapter 2.

[2] The introduction to that report provides a review of the development of the Effective Schools research.

questionnaire that contained 7 relatively open-ended questions (described below).

Much of the Effective Schools research is based on the efforts of individual principals and groups of teachers to raise the academic performance of students at particular schools. This, essentially, is a "bottom-up" process. The Committee's focus on school districts offers an opportunity to explore how the research can be applied through a "top-down" process, from district central office or county office to individual schools.

Selection of Districts and Data Gathering

Through reviews of the relevant literature, consultation with Effective Schools experts, and discussion with officials of the U.S. Department of Education, Committee staff identified a number of individual school districts that reportedly had Effective Schools projects in place. After additional data gathering, about 20 school districts and a county education office providing technical assistance to many districts were chosen to receive a questionnaire that asked the following 7 questions:

1) Which of the characteristics identified by the Effective Schools research are you trying to achieve? (Five of these characteristics are listed in the Committee's letter to you. If your school district has identified other school characteristics, please include these in your responses.)

2) What are your program's goals? (These would be in addition to the characteristics identified in the Effective Schools research and would include such things as (a) narrowing the achievement gap between minority and majority students, (b) raising all students' achievement test scores, or (c) improving student behavior and discipline.)

3) What indicators of program progress are you measuring? What have been your results to date? (Please indicate whether you are conducting detailed evaluations, longitudinal analyses, or comparisons of participating schools to other comparable, non-participating schools. Among the indicators that might be monitored are test scores, dropout rates, or attendance rates.)

4) How is your program being implemented? (Is participation in the program voluntary or mandatory for the district, for individual schools, for school principals, and for school staff? Also, please describe the involvement in the program by the district's central office, the school board, the State educational agency, the teachers' union (if any), outside agencies or consultants, parents, principals, and teachers.)

5) How much does your Effective Schools program cost, and what are its sources of funding? (If available, please provide total and per pupil annual funding required to implement the Effective Schools program, and annual amounts of assistance from the Federal government, State government, local government, and private sources.)

6) What are the characteristics of your school district? (Please describe your school district, providing the following information, if available: number of schools by grade level, average daily membership, average daily attendance, percentage of

average daily membership from different racial and ethnic backgrounds, percentage of children receiving free school lunches, overall high school dropout rate—indicating how this was calculated, percentage of students enrolled below modal grade, district's average pupil/teacher ratio, average per pupil expenditure.)

7) What are the characteristics of the schools participating in your Effective Schools program? (If possible, please provide data similar to that used above in question number 6 to describe the district as a whole.)

Following analysis of the responses to the questionnaire, 9 school districts and 1 county office were selected for inclusion in the Committee Print:

1. Caldwell, Idaho
2. Clovis, California
3. Joliet, Illinois
4. Kansas City, Missouri
5. La Joya, Texas
6. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
7. Prince George's County, Maryland
8. San Diego County Office of Education, California
9. South Harrison, Missouri
10. Spencerport, New York

These districts and county office were selected on the basis of how much their programs reflected the legislative definition of an Effective Schools project in the new legislation. Committee staff also sought to achieve a degree of geographic diversity, a range of enrollment sizes, and different racial and ethnic representation among the districts. The San Diego County Office of Education was included because, in its role as a provider of technical assistance to schools within many districts, it may offer important insights on how to facilitate establishment of Effective Schools projects at the district level.

Discussion

The following pages provide a brief discussion of the responses made by the various school systems. No effort has been made to perform a rigorous analysis of the questionnaires for several reasons. First, the questions are generally open-ended, eliciting responses that vary substantially in terms of detail and kind of information. Second, it was determined at the outset of this project that no undue burden was to be imposed on districts agreeing to participate. As a result, Committee staff made only a limited number of follow-up contacts with the respondents to clarify some of the information provided. Finally, although the respondents include many different kinds of schools systems, they are not statistically representative of districts across the country.

The systems' responses to each of the questions is considered briefly below. Following this section, the Committee Print provides a detailed description of each district's project based on the questionnaire responses.

CHARACTERISTICS TO BE ACHIEVED

The questionnaire sought to determine how the school systems were defining the characteristics of an effective school in their projects, that is, what were the practices and attitudes that are characteristic of such a school.[3]

Given the selection process, it was expected that all of the respondents seek to achieve the characteristics delineated in the Federal legislation. What is important is that each expands upon those core characteristics. For example, the Pittsburgh public school system adds a number of effective teaching characteristics to the core school characteristics. All but one of the districts add significant linkage between home and the school, or the community and the school, as a characteristic. Many include substantial "time on task" (portion of in-school time actually devoted to academic study) as another desired characteristic. Thus, it would appear that, for these districts, the core characteristics may be necessary, but not sufficient, to portray an Effective School.

OVERALL GOALS

The questionnaire asked school systems to describe their overall goals for students' performance and abilities. These goals are the outcomes that a school system wants to achieve as a result of helping its schools acquire the characteristics of an Effective School.

Respondents often define their goals as improvement in student achievement test scores, attendance rates, dropout rates, etc., and through a comparison of different groups of students. For example, the Prince George's County school system is seeking to narrow the gap between the test scores of white students and minority students. Others, such as Spencerport and Joliet want to close the gap that separates children from different socioeconomic groups.

Many of the districts specifically recognize that the performance gaps between different groups of students will not have been successfully closed unless lower performers are brought up to the level of higher performers. Prince George's County, for example, sets as one of its goals that a greater share of its students will score in the highest quartile on its tests.

A number of the respondents, such as Spencerport and Joliet, have established goals that, once attained, should be maintained over time. In these two districts, to be considered successful, a school must maintain the overall levels of performance for at least 3 years. For schools that have yet to attain those levels, the districts require that there be annual improvements in the performance of students.

INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

The descriptions of this aspect of the various Effective Schools projects included in this report are particularly uneven. The Committee questionnaire sought to identify the specific measurements used by school systems to determine whether they are succeeding and what results had been obtained to date. Some of the differ-

[3] These characteristics are often referred to as the "correlates" of the Effective Schools research.

ences among the respondents' descriptions are due to the ability of the school districts to provide the requested data. To some degree, the relative newness of these projects may also have precluded elaborate delineation of results. (Among the oldest projects is that in Spencerport which began in the 1982–83 school year.)

Given the nature of the overall goals (described above), it is hardly surprising that testing is a key indicator used by every district. Other indicators include student attendance rates and dropout rates. Clovis measures the level of student participation in team or group activities; Pittsburgh looks at how frequently students are retained in grade; Kansas City looks at enrollment levels in gifted and talented programs and in remedial education programs. Students are not the only ones whose performance is assessed. La Joya monitors teacher turnover and teacher attendance rates.

With regard to testing, the districts appear to use a combination of national norm-referenced tests (test takers' scores are compared to the performance of a nationally representative sample of test takers in some prior year) and State basic skills and minimum competency tests (typically, measuring whether students have mastered desired skills).

The results reported to the Committee are varied, precluding comparisons among these school systems. It is also not possible from the questionnaire data to conclude that particular Effective Schools projects have been successful. Nevertheless, officials of many of the districts described in the following pages assert that their projects have indeed improved educational outcomes.

IMPLEMENTATION

The specific implementation process differs from district to district. Nevertheless, there are certain key steps that all, or nearly all, of the districts have taken to establish and implement their Effective Schools projects.

Teams of principals and teachers, with parents and community representatives sometimes included, are established to bring different groups together to develop support for the project and to implement it. These teams are typically created on a school-by-school basis for the explicit purpose of developing an improvement plan for an individual school. These teams also often monitor and evaluate the building level plans and amend them if necessary. In some instances, teams are created at the districtwide level to coordinate and monitor the implementation of the project.

Outside assistance, most frequently in the form of technical assistance, is a recurrent feature of the implementation process. This assistance is often provided by State education personnel and by private consultants, some of whom are university faculty.

Instruction and training in what constitutes the Effective Schools research and how to implement an improvement program based upon that research is typically provided to administrators, teachers, and other staff.

Needs assessments are an integral feature of nearly every effort described in the following pages. Such assessments are among the

initial steps taken to identify what the various groups in the educational process believe to be problems.

Mandatory participation is the rule for the schools in these districts, with the exception of the efforts by the San Diego County Office of Education. In all but one of the districts responding to the questionnaire, every school in the district is involved in the Effective Schools project. In that one district, Pittsburgh, only a small number of schools participate, yet they are chosen by the district's central office and have to participate.

Structured implementation characterizes most of these districts. The process has a number of definite, precise steps that have to be taken. The roles of key actors, such as administrators, teachers, or parents, are defined in advance. The process often has stages for monitoring and evaluating the efforts to date and for modifying aspects of the process if necessary.

COST

From the responses provided, it is not possible to determine the average cost of implementation among the respondents. It proved difficult for most of the districts to provide precise cost data for the Effective Schools activities. Often the project is fully integrated into the on-going activities of the district and, therefore, not separately tracked.

Some Federal funds support these districts. Several districts noted that they used some of the Chapter 2 education block grant funding for Effective Schools activities. Additional Chapter 2 funds should be available for these activities when the new legislation is fully implemented.

Of special interest is the situation in Kansas City where desegregation litigation has generated State funding for the district's Effective Schools project.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISTRICTS

The districts described in this Committee Print range in size from an enrollment of less than 1,000 (South Harrison) to an enrollment in excess of 100,000 (Prince George's County). They provide a mix of urban, rural, and suburban environments. They include districts with hardly any minority representation among students (e.g., Spencerport) and districts enrolling mostly minority students (e.g., La Joya).

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAMS

With the exceptions of San Diego and Pittsburgh, all of the schools in each of the districts participate in an Effective Schools project. In Pittsburgh, it appears that the participating schools enroll a more economically disadvantaged student body (measured by receipt of free school lunch) than does the school system in general. The average size of participating schools also is larger than for all Pittsburgh schools; class size appears relatively similar.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

This section provides much of the detailed information provided by the school systems in response to the Committee's questionnaire. To the extent possible, text from the actual responses is reproduced below. To keep the Committee Print within an acceptable length and to keep the descriptions accessible to a broader audience, it was necessary in many instances to provide only excerpts. Also, paraphrasing of districts' responses is provided below at times. **Please note that all text taken verbatim from the questionnaire responses is printed in italics.**

CALDWELL, IDAHO

Characteristics to be Achieved

The Caldwell School District's More Effective Schools Project is premised upon the following findings drawn from the Effective Schools research:

- *Virtually all students are educable when educability is defined as pupil acquisition of basic school skills.*
- *Research concludes that the school effects are more powerful than familial effects. This conclusion must not be taken to mean that there is no familial effect in pupil acquisition of academic skills. In some families, background does not limit a student's ability to acquire basic school skills. But some families can enhance student achievement well beyond basic school skills.*
- *There is a positive correlation between academic student achievement and staff expectation.*
- *An emphasis upon learning, upon academic achievement, is the prime purpose of public education.*
- *Teachers and principals can and do make a key difference in the quality of education each child receives.*
- *A school building is a complex social system with a set of norms, beliefs, and patterns of behavior which can facilitate or hinder learning.*
- *Collaborative, cooperative, collegial, supportive, noncoercive planning, especially at the building level and accompanied by support from the district office personnel, is the key approach to improvement.*
- *The building principal has a key role in establishing the climate of his or her building.*
- *Change is a process, a series of related events. It is not one event.*
- *Ideal change fosters ownership and commitment by all participants.*
- *In many ways the schools in our district are effective. Our challenge is to make them more effective [by putting] the current educational research into practice.*
- *The effective schools project involves all school personnel.*
- *Because the climate of a school is dependent upon all of its occupants, the individual school building as a whole is the strategic unit for planned change. To obtain change, attention must be paid to the culture of the school; focusing on the behavior of individual teachers or students is not sufficient.*
- *Focusing on effective schools research may necessitate realignment of other priorities within the building.*

Overall Goals

Among the goals described by the district are the following:

Our district does achievement testing on an annual basis and those results are shared in the "Report Card". The school district is in the process of developing criterion referenced tests for mathematics and reading. The school district is using the test data to evaluate its effectiveness based on student outcomes. The district is looking at the test data to determine if equally high proportions of low and middle income students are mastering the essential curriculum. We look at the socioeconomic status of our students as we evaluate the standardized test data.

Indicators of Success

The Caldwell school district will be producing annually a "Report Card" giving detailed information about the characteristics and performance of each school in the system.

In 1988, three elementary schools entered an accreditation "warned status." The district has assigned a vice principal whose time will be divided among the three schools.

Caldwell uses the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) in grades 1–5, 7, and 10. Grades 6 and 8 take the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). The 11th graders are assessed on the Test of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP), a statewide program of assessment. Idaho also administers the Direct Writing Assessment (DWA) to all 8th and 11th graders.

Two of the district's schools have been identified by the U.S. Department of Education in its school recognition program.

Implementation

The school system's implementation process is focused on training and sensitizing its school administrators to the content of the Effective Schools research and ways of implementing a program based upon that research.

During the 1984 school year the Caldwell School District was first introduced to the "Effective Schools" research through presentations by our superintendent, Darrel Deide. The administrators' monthly in-service revolved around the research that was being conducted in this area. A list of major research findings, principles, and assumptions were developed and became a part of the school district's belief system. [The findings were delineated under "Characteristics to be Achieved" above.]

As the school district continued to raise the awareness level of the administrators in regard to the "Effective Schools" research, the district determined that the research is applicable to a suburban school system and all levels of that school system. It provides a most powerful model for studying and developing plans for school improvement. As a result of the continued training and dialogue within each building, discussion has centered around educationally significant topics.

A definite process is emerging as the schools are looking at implementing an effective schools project within their build-

ings. Briefly these stages include: Awareness, In-service, Project design, Needs assessment, Formulation of building plans, Implementation, and Evaluation. At this time various schools are at different stages in this development. As goals are developed by the administrative team in each school building for the 1988-89 school year these goals will tie in with where that building is in its planning and implementation.

The administrative team of the Caldwell School District has continued on-going extensive training in the areas of the effective schools research over the past year. This training has included a two credit class through the College of Idaho, [an] "Effective Schools Workshop". . . .

The school district administrative team also spent three separate days in drive-in workshops sponsored by the Idaho School Administrator Assistance Center. . . . These workshops tied into the effective schools research by specifically translating the most current research on effective leadership and student achievement into practical, proven day to day strategies the educational leader can use to maximize teacher and student achievement. . . .

As the "Effective School Research" project continues in the Caldwell schools, it is essential that every school believes that all children can learn and that all teachers and administrators can help them. Nothing less is acceptable. Most important, this expectation must be conveyed to students. As participating administrators in [the] Caldwell effective school project we must take an honest look at ourselves and our role as instructional leaders. The challenge of everyone committed to effective schools is exciting, threatening, promising, time consuming and sometimes painful.

Characteristics of the District

The Caldwell school district consists of 3 elementary schools, 1 middle school (grades 6 and 7), 1 junior high school (grades 8 and 9), and 1 high school. In February 1988, the system enrolled 4,077 students—75 percent were white, 24 percent were Hispanic, 1 percent were Asian, .2 percent were black, and .4 percent were Native American.

The estimated dropout rate for the district rose slightly from 23.6 percent in 1987 to 24.2 percent in 1988. This rate is calculated by comparing the number of graduating seniors to the number of enrolled students 3 years earlier.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All schools are participating in the Effective Schools program.

CLOVIS, CALIFORNIA

Characteristics to be Achieved

The Clovis Unified School District, in Clovis, California, is trying to achieve the following characteristics in its Effective School effort:

- *a system of school-based management, with strong leadership from the principal*
- *[a] focus on academic achievement*
- *high teacher expectations for all students*
- *a clearly stated accountability system, with frequent monitoring of pupil and program progress*
- *commitment to [the] proposition that all children can learn*
- *[an] emphasis on school attendance*
- *parent and community involvement*
- *co-curricular involvement of students [described below]*
- *[a] safe and orderly school environment*

Overall Goals

Clovis has set several specific goals or outcomes that it is working toward. The system wants to:

- *[Ensure that] [a]t least 90% of all students graduating from the Clovis Unified School District will qualify for entry into the California State University system.*
- *Enable every student to maximize his/her capabilities in mind (academics), body (physical fitness), and spirit (attitude, character).*
- *Insure that at least 90% of all students read, write, and compute in mathematics at or above grade level.*

Indicators of Success

The school system is collecting an array of data, linked to the overall goals and characteristics being sought. The following are identified in the system's response to the Committee questionnaire:

CURRICULAR. Test results from outside, secure tests—California Assessment Program and Advanced Placement—are used as instructional quality indicators. Curriculum alignment with recommended state frameworks, and appropriate evaluation of student achievement, should foster success in these state and national assessment programs.

CO-CURRICULAR. Outcomes of team or group participation in athletic contests, musical performances, and a wide array of activities from academic decathlon to forensics and debate, are quantified to receive a rating for each school.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT. Parents and community evaluate school climate and campus appearance. Parent participation in school and district advisory meetings and parents' ratings of the overall quality of each school also contribute to this category. Survey of all parents is conducted annually.

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT. Student attendance, clean campus, and classroom care are evaluated. Student attendance is quantified through a formula based on percentage of unexcused absences per enrollment. Parent teams judge the appearance of each campus, once per semester, using established criteria.

OTHER QUALITY INDICATORS. Individuals, student groups, and schools are noted for achievement of national, state, or local awards. Number of students eligible for California State University admission upon high school graduation, SAT results, and exemplary or distinguished school recognition add to the school's rating.

These indicators constitute a critical component of the Effective Schools effort in the district. The data gathered are used as follows:

Progress toward goals is systematically and frequently monitored in each category by school. This feedback to school principals provides data to support decisions made relative to curriculum, resources, and program priorities. The data also contributes to a School Report Card issued at the end of the school year. The report card includes twenty-one additional factors which include vandalism, class size average, ethnic and socioeconomic description, dropout rates, etc.

Each school receives an annual rating that reflects how well accountability criteria are achieved. The categories are Superior, Excellent, Good, or Needs Improvement. Survey and test results, along with other quantifiable data, make up an objective rating scale.

As provided by the school district, the following results have been achieved:

- *The CTBS [Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills] was administered annually through 1986–87. Student scores in 1972 were in the 40th percentiles for reading, math, and language. In 1986–87, 92 percent of the K–8 students were on grade level or above in math, 82 percent in reading, and 87 percent in language.*
- *Since 1980, the district's California Assessment Program scores in all areas have been above or within the expectancy bands for similar school districts. In 1986–87, eleven of fourteen schools scored above the expectancy band.*
- *SAT scores have increased progressively over the past three years. District norms are above state and national averages.*
- *Both female students and Hispanic students score above state and national averages on the SAT in the comparison with their respective subgroup norms.*
- *The success rate on Advanced Placement examinations has increased from 13.4 per 100 students in 1984, to 35.8 per 100 students in 1988.*
- *The high school dropout rate by ethnic group is very low in contrast to national norms.*

- *School attendance rate is an average of 93.4 [percent] bodily present daily and 99.1 [percent] either bodily present or on excused absence.*
- *Vandalism is less than $2 per student annually.*
- *Three schools have received National Exemplary Status—one elementary, one intermediate, and one high school. Several others have been named distinguished schools at the state level.*
- *Five schools were nominated in 1987–88 as Model Compensatory Education Schools by the California State Department of Education, on the basis of minority/ethnic student achievement.*

Implementation

All schools in the district participate. The district's accountability system, which drives the effective schools program was established in 1972. There is an ongoing motivation at each site to work effectively each year and to better performance from year to year. The district is one of the few in California in which teachers are not unionized. Roles of principals, school staffs, parents, school board, and central office staff can be described as follows:

School Board and District Administrative Functions

Leadership. In their leadership roles, the school board and district administration are responsible for the cornerstones of Mission and Accountability.

Mission. In setting the mission, the board and administration articulate direction and goals that provide consistency of purpose across the district. The desired outcome is to unite the entire district into an educational team with common vision, providing a framework for sound educational decisionmaking.

Accountability. Greater freedom and autonomy at school sites require accountability to maintain standards and to provide feedback for program improvement. . . .

Results provide an annual performance report to each school site which serves as a report card and as a basis for annual planning. Results are also reported back to the community through School Assessment Review Teams (SARTs).

Support. An equally important function, in response to school site autonomy and decisionmaking, is support. As principals, with their staffs, formulate plans and identify needs, the superintendent, other district administrators, and school board become "variable removers" and resource allocators. . . .

Principal and Site Level Functions

Principal. The principal, as "captain of the ship," has full authority within the parameters of district-set mission and goals, to function as chief executive officer at the school site. Determination of "method and "content" are site leadership's domain. . . .

Program Development and School-site Budgeting. Program development and school-site budgeting are determined by student performance goals and by diagnosed student needs. Teachers diagnose individual student needs, determine resources required to meet needs, and develop a strategic plan for the entire class. Once devel-

oped, the plan is submitted to the principal for discussion. . . . The collection of teachers' classroom plans at a site become the basis for the principal's strategic plan for the school. . . .

Site plans and budgets from each of the schools fold into the district plan and budget. The final result is a comprehensive district blueprint for action, which supports improved student performance, determined by school-site personnel.

Parent and Community Participation. Parent and community participation in the management process is provided through School Assessment Review Teams (SARTs) at each school. These teams include the principal, selected teachers, and parent volunteers. . . . SARTs serve as school advisory councils, working cooperatively with school staff on educational issues and serving as school-community liaisons. . . . A district level SART is made up of parent representatives and principals from each school site. A major undertaking of the district SART is an annual Parent Survey. The survey results are used both at school sites and at the district level in the accountability process.

COST

The Clovis Unified School District does not have an "effective schools" budget. The district believes that development of effective schools is the result of effective management, planning, and judicious use of normal funding. The district's a.d.a. allotment falls within the lowest quartile in comparison with other districts in the county and the state. The state revenue limit for 1988–89 is estimated at $2,779 per pupil.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISTRICT

Historically, CUSD [Clovis Unified School District] has been rural in nature, with a significant number of migrant families from Mexico and Southeast Asia choosing unincorporated areas of the District as a home base. Now in the path of urban development, however, its composition is changing to a more urban-suburban pattern.

While the District is changing, all segments of the socio-economic spectrum are presented with a preponderance of the population in the lower middle quartile. Although the District projects an image of affluence with well maintained, attractive schools and facilities, it is actually a low wealth district. Its operation budget per pupil is one of the lowest in California for unified school districts of comparable size.

The school district has 21 schools—15 elementary schools, 2 intermediate schools (grades 7 and 8), 2 high schools (grades 9 through 12), 1 continuation school, and 1 adult education school. For the 1988–89 school year, the enrollment is slightly more than 19,000.

Of the school enrollment, 73.3 percent is white, 16.3 percent is Hispanic, 6.6 percent is Asian/Pacific Islander, 1.7 percent is black, 1.5 percent is American Indian, and .4 percent is Filipino.

Twenty percent of enrolled students receive a free lunch; 12.6 percent of students' families receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

The annual dropout rate for 1986–87 was 4 percent. This is the percentage of 10th through 12th graders who drop out each year. A dropout for this calculation was defined as *any student who has been enrolled in grade 10, 11, or 12, but who left school prior to graduation or the completion of a formal education, or legal equivalent, and who did not within 45 school days enter another public or private educational institution or school program, as documented by a written request for a transcript from that institution.*

The average pupil/teacher ratio was 30.6/1 in 1987–88.

The average per pupil expenditure in 1987–88 was $3,334.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All of the district's schools are participating in the Effective Schools program.

JOLIET, ILLINOIS

(District #86)

Characteristics to be Achieved

Our School Improvement Program, based on Effective Schools research, revolves around the following correlates:

- *Clear and Focused Mission*
- *Instructional Leadership*
- *Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress*
- *Safe and Orderly Environment*
- *High Expectations*
- *Home/School Relationships*
- *Opportunity to Learn—Time on Task*

These correlates are not presented in any order of priority.

The District #86 definition of an effective school is:

An effective school is one in which all students learn the basic curriculum regardless of their previous academic performance, handicap, family background, socio-economic status, race and/or gender. For a school to be effective, two standards must be achieved:

Quality—The achievement level of all students must be high.

Equity—The distribution of high achievement is consistent across the major subsets of the student population.

Overall Goals

The goal of our School Improvement Program is to raise student achievement in a manner that reflects both quality and equity. As a result, we have established long-range districtwide achievement goals and individual building goals.

The long-range goals are:

District #86 considers a school to be effective when it has achieved or exceeded the following standards:

1) 95% of students must demonstrate mastery at the 80% level or above on criterion referenced tests.

2) On a norm referenced test all students must score at the 50% percentile or higher, based upon national norms.

3) There shall be no significant difference in the proportion of students demonstrating mastery of the basic curriculum as a function of socio-economic status as indicated by the educational level of the mother.

4) The above criteria must be attained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

Should a school not be effective according to the above definition, the following must occur:

1) There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of the students who demonstrate mastery on the criterion referenced tests and norm referenced tests.

2) There shall be an annual decrease in the discrepancy between the proportion of students from the lower socio-economic class demonstrating mastery of the basic curriculum as compared with the proportion of students from higher socio-economic classes demonstrating mastery of the basic curriculum.

In addition, District #86 requires that each building disaggregate their student data to assure that there is equity across subgroups. Example: Low socio-economic vs. average or affluent, boys vs. girls, blacks vs. whites.

Indicators of Success

We are presently utilizing standardized achievement tests (Iowa Test of Basic skills) and are in the process of implementing criterion referenced tests in each academic area.

Since we have explained to the Board that it will take three to five years to make an impact on student achievement, we also use the evaluations that are built into the individual School Improvement Plans of the buildings. [See discussion below in Implementation.]

In addition to reporting student achievement data, they are required to report and document progress and success of the activities built into their School Improvement Plans.

. . . Student progress will be reviewed annually by the faculty and submitted to the Superintendent. The following information is to be submitted to the Superintendent for review by the end of the school year: 1) achievement test results by grade for the present year and the two previous years in quartile report form for reading, language arts, and math; 2) disaggregate[d] analysis of achievement results by building; 3) criterion referenced test results of student mastery by grade for language arts and math; and 4) disaggregate[d] analysis of criterion referenced test results by building.

Implementation

School Improvement Process

The Joliet Public School Board and the Superintendent of Schools, serving as its chief executive officer, assume ultimate responsibility for implementation of the School Improvement Process in the district. The Board accepts responsibility for determining policy and goals, and in providing staff with appropriate financial and human resources. The Superintendent accepts responsibility for assuring that the practices undertaken in the process are consistent with School Board intent, are educationally sound, and are in compliance with legal codes and state statute. The Superintendent is responsible for providing the leadership necessary in helping the district focus on its stated mission and achieving standards of effectiveness.

Since each school building is unique, flexibility is needed in developing instructional programs that will assure achievement of

District goals as they relate to school improvement. The District defines the role of the principal as the instructional leader. The principal provides the leadership to help the school focus on its stated mission and achieve the District's standards of effectiveness.

One of the first major steps in the school improvement process, at the building level, is the selection of the staff members that will become the building level team. The team selected will work in collaboration with the principal to implement the school improvement process in the building. The major function of the team is to prepare a three year school improvement plan by which student achievement will increase. Once the plan has been developed the team will be responsible for implementing, monitoring, adjusting, and evaluating it.

Building Level Team

Elementary teams will consist of three staff members, the principal, one central staff member. The junior high teams will consist of six staff members, the principal, and one central staff member.

Each building will be also select two alternate members. Once the team has been selected the names of the members and alternates are to be submitted to the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction for final approval. Each staff is expected to determine tenure of team members and develop a means for rotating and replacing members on the team.

The role of the building level team is crucial to the school improvement process. It is essential that the team reflect the make-up of the total faculty. Selection of the members can take place in a variety of ways.

It is recommended that each team receive initial training in group dynamics and planning. This training can be provided by principals and team members or provided by district staff. It is the responsibility of the team to determine additional training and request resources needed.

One of the functions of the team during the first year is the establishment of specific means for communicating both formally and informally with the faculty. It is important that the faculty is made aware of what is being discussed by the building level team and given an opportunity to provide input and feedback throughout the process.

As a school enters the School Improvement Process, one year is devoted to assessing building needs and developing a three year school improvement plan. During this year each building is provided substitutes for the team to meet nine half days during the school year. In addition each building is provided a building fund of $1200/Elementary, $2400/Junior High, to conduct meetings as needed and purchase resources necessary for completion of the plan. Once the plan has been written the school enters into the implementation stage of the three year process. During the first and second years of implementation the District will provide substitutes for the team to meet four half days each year to monitor and revise the plan. During the third year of implementation a team is again given substitutes for nine half day meetings to reassess needs and develop a plan for the next three years.

Development of the School Improvement Plan

Each building is required to submit a written three year school improvement plan. The Improvement Plan must be based upon assessment of needs in regard to 1) student achievement, 2) assessment of correlates, and 3) archival data.

The plan submitted to the District will serve as a working document which highlights the overall needs, the building mission, goals, and objectives and outlines activities which will assist the building in reaching their stated goals.

. . . This year we have implemented a district monitoring system in order to evaluate on a regular basis the individual building School Improvement Plans. Referenced below is the manner in which we monitor the individual plans at the district level.

Monitoring

School improvement will be monitored both at the District and Building level. Monitoring at the school level will be determined by the building level team as described within their plan and carried out by the building staff.

The District will be responsible for monitoring the building process, implementation of the plan, and improvement of student achievement.

During the planning year a resource person is assigned to the building team by the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of Instruction. The resource person is expected to attend all scheduled building level team meetings to provide assistance in developing a three year plan. As a member of the team the resource person provides information in regard to current research in education, staff development, past practices, successful programs operating within the district, and educational practices pertinent to the development of the plan. The major role of the resource person is to facilitate the development of the plan. During the implementation process the resource person is utilized as needed.

Upon completion of the first draft, the plan is submitted to the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction by March 1 of the planning year. After reviewing the draft the Assistant Superintendent will schedule a meeting with the building level team to provide feedback and an opportunity for discussion.

The final draft of the plan approved by the Assistant Superintendent of Instruction is submitted by May 1 to the Superintendent. The Superintendent will review the plan and indicate in writing approval or recommendations for revision by June 1. A faculty meeting will be scheduled with the Superintendent in the fall of the first year of the plan to discuss student achievement and support needed to implement the plan.

. . . In summary we can say that our School Improvement Program was a top down, bottom up process. By that I mean we sensitized the Board and the staff to the need for the program. The Board then authorized support of the program districtwide. At that point management took on a resource and support posture to the buildings. It is for that reason I think we have been successful. The program is really driven at this time by the individual buildings.

Cost

Since it is a districtwide program where everyone is involved, including Special education and Chapter 1 and all supportive programs, we consolidated our staff development money in order to provide released time over a three-month period for the individual building level teams to analyze their building needs and develop school improvement plans.

School Improvement Implementation Expenditures

Item	1986-87	1987-88	(Projected) 1988-89	(Projected) 1989-90
Consultant Fees	$14,516	$8,426	$8,426	$4,213
Conference Costs	3,300	2,975	1,500	1,500
Stipends	6,760	4,050	3,900	-0-
Substitutes	4,320	9,675	10,950	10,700
Building Fund	9,600	10,800	9,600	-0-
Needs Assessment	-0-	700	700	700
Totals	$38,496	$36,626	$35,076	$17,113

Funding Sources for 1987-88

	Approximate Cost/Funding Source
Staff Development State Grant	$9,329
Chapter 2 Federal Grant	17,400
Reading Improvement State Grant	2,897
Special Education Federal Grant (94-142)	5,000
Curriculum Budget	2,000

Characteristics of the District

Joliet District #86 is a K-8 district with approximately 8,700 students. We have 21 buildings plus special education and preschool. We operate 17 elementary buildings and 4 junior highs with a staff of approximately 1,000 employees.

We are our own administrative district for special education and offer a program for every handicapping condition. We have a large Chapter 1 program, bilingual program, gifted program, vocational education program, etc.

The district's student population is approximately 56% minority with 40% being black and 16% being Hispanic. Free lunches are provided for 61% of our student population and another 7% receive reduced price meals. Joliet can be described as an urban district with a representative low socio-economic population.

The district's average pupil/teacher ratio is 21.7/1 with an average per pupil expenditure of $3,480.00.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All schools are participating.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Characteristics to be Achieved

The Effective School characteristics that the KCMSD [Kansas City Missouri School District] is emphasizing are:

1) Clearly defined goals and objectives.

2) High expectations for all students by instructional leaders and instructional staff.

3) Strong effective leadership by the principal and instructional staff.

4) Creation and maintenance of a safe and orderly school climate conducive to teaching and learning.

5) Continuous monitoring and evaluation of student progress.

6) Positive Parent-Community involvement.

Overall Goals

The program's goals are:

1) Improvement of academic performance with a major emphasis upon significant annual improvement of student achievement in reading and mathematics with the objectives of reaching or exceeding norms in these areas.

2) Provide a systematic, continuous planning process at the school level which emphasizes the cooperation of the community and staff in the development and implementation of Effective School Improvement plans which address school-site and districtwide goals.

3) Provide a process to improve skills in developing school improvement plans and to increase the effectiveness of instructional activities at the school-site level.

Indicators of Success

The indicators of program progress that are being measured are:

1) The ITBS [Iowa Test of Basic Skills], TAP [Test of Achievement and Proficiency] standardized tests, and MMAT [Missouri Mastery and Achievement Test] criterion reference[d] test.

2) Student Grades.

3) Enrollments in advanced or honors courses, gifted programs.

4) Enrollments in remedial programs.

5) Dropout rates.

6) Student Attendance.

7) Student, parental and teacher attitudes.

According to the district, over the past 10 years, its secondary school annual dropout rate rose to 7.7 percent in 1981-82 but fell steadily since then to 2.6 percent in 1987-88.

The district reports that its overall attendance rate appears to have been relatively stable since 1981-82. Between 1986-87 and 1987-88, the rate fell from 90.7 percent to 89.6 percent.

Implementation

The state of Missouri funds the Effective Schools program in the following amounts: schools with enrollments of 90% or more black students receive $125,000 and schools with less than 90% enrollment receive $100,000. Decisions on the expenditure of the allocated amount are based upon a plan developed by an existing school advisory committee for each school.

Each school principal is responsible for forming a School Site Planning Team. The team has three major tasks:

1) To develop an Effective Schools Improvement plan utilizing the Effective Schools correlates.

2) To implement and assist in monitoring and assessing the plan.

3) To prepare an evaluation report summarizing the implementation of the plan. Each team has a team chairperson.

The role of the principal is critical in guiding the team to develop a plan that ensures the inclusion of the current Effective Schools research and appropriate activities to meet student needs. The school district of Kansas City, Missouri formed the School Advisory Committees (SAC) to achieve cooperation among community people and school personnel in order to improve education and schools in accordance with the school district's goals. The school district['s] . . . Board of Education has specifically empowered the School Advisory Committees to achieve the following goals:

- *advise the principal of concerns among students, parents, and community members.*
- *study developments of various kinds as they affect the local school and the district.*
- *plan and carry out ways by which parents and other citizens at large can become regularly and appropriately informed about their local schools and the school district.*
- *facilitate the communication and discussion of school and district issues between individuals and among groups.*

A SAC member is represented on the School-Site Planning team. Decisions on how the Effective Schools funds shall be spent is based upon a School Improvement Plan developed by the School-Site Planning Team. The team makes recommendations to the Board of Education [with] regard to how these funds will be spent at the school which they represent. The Board of Education reviews and takes action [on] the appropriateness of these expenditures. All schools with program are required to participate. The program gives equal emphasis to both school-wide factors and classroom instruction.

The program involves familiarizing the school staff [with] the relevant research, conducting needs assessments, and formulating and implementing School Improvement plans, and assessing results.

The School Improvement plans are critiqued for their efficiency; do they incorporate the required steps necessary for improving test scores? This is one checkpoint. The plans are evaluated for their effectiveness; did they do what they were intended to do? This is the second checkpoint.

COST

On February 19, 1985, the KCMSD submitted to the [Federal District] Court an intradistrict plan that proposed systemic educational improvements that would provide enhanced educational climate and achievement opportunities for those students remaining in racially segregated schools and that would foster voluntary integration. In particular, the plan cited certain characteristics of schools with effective academic programs. These characteristics include: clearly defined goals and objectives; strong leadership by the principal and instructional staff; an orderly and safe climate; high expectations for students; continuous monitoring; and parent involvement. The District requested financial support for implementing Effective School programs for all schools with reading scores falling below the national average. The District estimated the cost of implementing the effective school project at $4,100,000, based on data showing that 41 of 50 elementary schools were below national norms in reading.

In its June 14, 1985 Order, the Court awarded funding for implementing the Effective Schools component. For the 1985-86 school year, this included $75,000 for each of the 25 elementary schools with over 90% black enrollment and $50,000 for each of the remaining 43 schools. The Court ordered this amount to increase for the 1986-87 school year to $100,000 for the schools with over 90% black enrollment and to $75,000 for the remaining schools, and for the 1987-88 school year to $125,000 and $100,000 respectively. The Court directed that during the 1985-86 school year that the funds for improved student achievement were to be spent on components contained in the district plan in accordance with decisions by the KCMSD. . . .

In its 1986 Order, the Court allowed the Effective Schools program to expand to include four special schools—Fairview, Delano, Anderson, and the Teenage Parent Center—and approved $75,000 to be divided among the four schools on the basis of student population. The total budget approved for the Effective Schools component for the 1986-87 school year was $5,275,000. The Court further ordered that with regard to the effective schools program:

> *KCMSD shall not institute any procedures or strategies which would result in normal district level activities being paid for by the Effective Schools component. Nor shall KCMSD reduce any present district level activities and place the financial burden on individual schools to purchase these services utilizing Effective School resources.*
>
> *The KCMSD implemented Effective Schools programs in the 1986-87 school year. Each school developed its own site plan using guidelines prescribed by the Associate Superintendent of Elementary and Secondary Operations.*

The Court approved the funding requested for the Effective Schools component for 1988-89 through 1990-91 in its Order of July 25, 1988. The KCMSD has reviewed the approved budget for 1989-90 of $7,025,000 and has determined that the District will need $7,025,000 to continue the program approved by the Court.

Characteristics of the District

The Kansas City school system has 52 elementary schools (with various combinations of grades up to grade 6); 9 middle schools (grades 6-8); and 9 senior high schools (8 have grades 9-12, 1 has grades 6-12). The district also has 6 special schools, among them a teenage parent center. The district's total average daily membership (ADM) is 35,171. Slightly more than 50 percent of enrolled students receive school lunches. The annual average dropout rate for all secondary schools in 1987-88 was 2.5 percent; the rate for senior high schools was 3.9 percent.

The district's average per pupil expenditure for 1987-88 was $5,617.41.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All schools in the district participate in the effective schools program.

LA JOYA, TEXAS

Characteristics to be Achieved

The La Joya Independent School District is striving to be an effective school district characterized by the following:

- *a safe and positive school climate where teaching and learning are emphasized and rewarded*
- *high expectations by all members of the organization and a commitment and dedication to the belief that all students will achieve success*
- *transformational instructional leaders who effectively communicate the mission of the district to staff, parents, community, and students*
- *a strong instructional focus which supports academic achievement for all children by stressing academic goals, objectives, and priorities*
- *continuous monitoring and reporting of pupil and program progress through the use of test instruments and other non test related data*

Overall Goals

In order to operationalize our philosophy and beliefs in a comprehensive and organized manner, the district has adopted the Outcomes-Driven Developmental Model (ODDM)—called the La Joya Independent School District Framework for School Excellence. . . .

The ODDM is built on the premise that neither illiteracy nor failure are inevitable or acceptable consequences of schooling for ANYONE. Through ODDM, La Joya schools are expected to become "success-based" rather than "selection-oriented"—establishing the instructional management procedures and delivery conditions which will enable all students to learn and demonstrate those skills necessary for continued success. . . .

Desired outcomes are those exit behaviors that we are striving to accomplish with all of our students. They include:

1) having a positive self-esteem as a learner and a person

2) performing cognitively from low to high levels—both critically and creatively

3) demonstrating effective process skills, including problem-solving, communication, decision-making, accountability, and group process skills

4) functioning as self-directed learners

5) showing concern for others

6) demonstrating proficiency in two languages—English and Spanish

7) effectively utilizing computer technology, and

8) developing and maintaining physical well-being.

In order to accomplish these desired outcomes, the La Joya Independent School District has identified the following goals:

Goal 1—To develop and implement support systems that will enhance teaching and learning

Goal 2—To develop and implement administrative support practices that will enhance the instructional programs

Goal 3—To develop and implement practices that will promote community support and involvement, and foster support from the Board of Education

Goal 4—To create conditions that allow for transformational leadership, by providing staff members opportunities for professional growth, participation, and leadership

Indicators of Success

The La Joya school district is monitoring the progress of its Effective Schools program through indicators focusing on students, staff, and parents/community.

The student indicators include attendance, dropout rates, participation in special programs (among them, bilingual education, special education, and gifted education), performance on basic skills measures (Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills, Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, and Informal Reading Inventories), promotion and retention rates, and performance in "creative/productive thinking" (teacher ratings, parent questionnaires, and several psychometric testing instruments).

The staff indicators include attendance, turn-over rates, evaluations through the Texas Teacher Appraisal System and the La Joya Independent School District Administrators' Performance Appraisal.

The indicators assessing parent/community performance include the extent of parental participation in school activities and responses on parental questionnaires and surveys.

The school district responded as follows about the success it has had to date:

- *Student test scores are steadily improving, particularly in Reading and Writing.*
- *Student strengths and needs are being more clearly identified via an individual student diagnostic profile.*
- *During the 1987-88 school year, the district experienced the lowest professional turn-over rate in several years.*
- *Staff participation in after-school and Saturday professional development sessions increased significantly.*
- *Numbers of parents visiting and volunteering in the schools increases each year.*
- *Strong parent participation occurs at Parent Education sessions conducted by district personnel.*

Implementation

The Outcomes Driven Developmental Model (ODDM) being implemented by the La Joya school system was originated by the Johnson City, New York school district. According to the questionnaire response from the La Joya school system, ODDM *is the only*

total school improvement model recognized by the National Diffusion Network administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

The superintendent of the La Joya school district informed Committee staff that the ODDM should be considered a framework for implementing change, not a prescribed program. It is premised upon the belief that reform occurs when administrators, teachers, board members, and community work collaboratively. Different aspects of the school system are not considered in isolation. For example, instructional change cannot be addresses without attention to curriculum and student outcomes. As implemented in La Joya, the ODDM resulted initially in two major changes—the system is now focused on outcomes; and school improvement is viewed as a holistic process affecting the entire educational program.

The process was implemented in La Joya partly through 2 years of training. During those initial 2 years, a core group drawn from every school campus went through 15 days of training. This training covered the basic research upon which the ODDM was developed. In April 1987 an assessment of the district's climate was conducted. The overall framework was then reassessed in light of the district's work to date. A continuing appraisal process is underway with the central office sending monitoring teams into individual schools.

Cost

The Framework for School Excellence is not a packaged effective school program. It is a "process" model for achieving school excellence. Each component of the model is critical if the district's goals are to be realized. The model enables staff to examine district programs and practices and provides direction for decision making. All district programs are aligned with the philosophy, beliefs, and practices of the outcomes-based model; therefore, all federal, state, and local resources are utilized to support our comprehensive school improvement effort.

Characteristics of the District

The district consists of 8 schools—6 elementary schools, 1 junior high school, and 1 high school. The total enrollment for 1987–88 was 8,450 (average daily membership—8,109; average daily attendance—7,698).

Of that enrollment, 98.6 percent were Hispanic; 1.39 percent were white; and .01 percent were black. Of the Hispanic enrollment, 43.5 percent were children of migrant families.

According to the district's questionnaire response, 82.14 percent of the enrolled students are economically disadvantaged.

The cumulative high school dropout rate is currently above 40 percent.

The pupil/teacher ratio through grade 4 is 22 to 1. The ratio for grades 5 through 12 is 25 to 1.

The district's annual average per pupil expenditure is $3,000.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All schools in the district are participating in the program.

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA

Characteristics to be Achieved

In Pittsburgh, the School Improvement Project (SIP) subscribes to a combination of school effects correlates. The correlates are:

1) Effective Schools Characteristics

- *Strong instructional leadership from the principal*
- *Regular and frequent monitoring of student progress*
- *Emphasis on the basic skills*
- *An orderly learning environment*
- *Cooperative school/community relationship*

2) Effective Teaching Characteristics

- *Maximum student time on task*
- *Appropriate student placement in the curriculum and grouping for instruction*
- *Appropriate pacing and sequencing of instruction to assure maximum student achievement*
- *Maximum student exposure to direct instruction from the teacher*

Overall Goals

The major goals of the project are:

1) To fuse districtwide priorities/programs with local school improvement efforts.

2) To develop and test school improvement strategies for improving student achievement as well as classroom effectiveness.

3) To develop an ongoing Data Resource Bank (pertinent statistical/school level data) that will encourage strong instructional leadership, foster instructional problem solving at the classroom level, increase the use of data for sound instructional decisionmaking, and provide longitudinal evaluation profiles.

4) To put into place a computerized monitoring system to facilitate the use of district and building level data that will: (a) establish academic standards; (b) verify mastery of basic skills; (c) assure prescriptive remediation; and (d) permit principals, teachers, and supervisory personnel to systematically focus on student progress and teacher performance.

5) To establish a collaborative problem solving mechanism (within/across grade levels) to increase the delivery of instructional services to the learner through shared professional decision making.

6) To establish a multi-disciplinary Tapping [1] and staffing process for systematically addressing the needs of "at-risk" students and narrowing the achievement gap between Black and White pupils. This process will lead towards early academic intervention and modification strategies.

7) To establish a student management program designed to maximize teaching time vis-a-vis student time on task within a milieu of mutual respect, student responsibility, and self-esteem.

Indicators of Success

The program currently uses a comprehensive assessment procedure for entering and exiting a SIP school. The procedure requires the collection and analyses of district/school level data that yields an in-depth profile of the instructional and climate status of each building. Indicators presently being measured are:

- *Longitudinal achievement profile (seven years of norm reference[d] data compared to the district)*
- *Changes in the reading configuration for each building (number of students moving from below grade level to on or above grade level)*
- *Reduction in the number of retentions and/or overaged students*
- *Assessment of discipline conditions (decrease or increase of time on task)*
- *Teacher and student absenteeism*
- *Student referral rate to Special Education*
- *Increased parental involvement*
- *Disaggregation of achievement data by race and sex*
- *Reduction in the number of at-risk students*
- *Attendance rate*
- *Number of students referred to the Scholars Program*

Strong instructional leadership is another important program indicator. In an attempt to measure strong instructional leadership over time, our program applies an administrative assessment procedure. This procedure matches demonstrative administrative performance, as enumerated in the literature, with observable building level routines, policies, patterns, and scenarios. These observable behaviors are then matched with the appropriate skill/knowledge base requirements for principals to meet the minimum instructional leadership competencies/products for school improvement.

Program Impact

Results to Date:

- *The program has resulted in a noticeable increase in basic achievement on norm-reference[d] tests. More specifically, out of*

[1] Under SIP, a student who shows consistent non-mastery of the components of the instructional program qualifies for the next level of SIP intervention. That level is called TAP or Teacher Action Planning (Tapping). As described by the school system, *Teacher Action Planning provides a process for mainstream classroom teachers to respond to particular educational and behavioral needs of students within the environment of the regular classroom. The TAP concept has evolved from the philosophical basis that most students do not qualify and should not be considered for special education placement, and yet many students do evidence behavior and academic difficulties that interfere with their classroom success. The TAP procedure involves teams of teachers in a problem solving process. The accumulated skills and knowledge of the professional team are directed at designing strategies to address the needs of students.*

twelve schools originally selected for the program, five have been phased out [of the program] and have maintained a respectable level of continued achievement. Two are currently assigned to a maintenance and assessment phase (limited support and continued assessment), while five continue to receive full support.

- *There has been a reduction of discipline [problems] with an accompanying increase in time on task.*
- *Bi-weekly planning sessions have resulted in greater collaborative planning and problem solving at the building level.*
- *An increase in parental involvement*
- *Multi-disciplinary Tapping [see earlier definition] and staffing procedures have resulted in greater corrective remediation of individual students, a reduction in the number of student referred to special education, a corresponding increase in the number of students assigned to the Scholars Program, and an improved process for assisting students who are at-risk.*
- *The use of district/building level data provide[s] for detailed evaluation, longitudinal analyses, and districtwide comparability assessments.*

Implementation

The School Improvement Project in Pittsburgh is mandatory for individual schools (selected by central staff), for school principals, and for school staff. The program is based on collaborative planning as well as shared professional decisionmaking.

The program also attempts to forge instructional consensus around specific program goals/strategies for increasing the effectiveness of individual schools. This done by: (1) fusing a clinical analysis approach with the characteristics of Effective Schools research; (2) using school level data with implementation and change theory; and (3) combining Effective Schools research with external program initiatives to systematically alter the behaviors of daily routines, practices, and policies to assure greater academic output at the classroom level.

Another essential component of the implementation process is strong instructional leadership linked to ongoing staff development training. This component stresses collaborative planning and problem-solving by focusing on the use of data vis-a-vis an effective delivery system in areas of greatest instructional need.

The use of an information/monitoring system provides a coordinated process for collecting and utilizing school-level data for sound instructional decisionmaking. The use of the data also provides an ongoing evaluation and assessment profile for each participating building to determine the success of their action plan for mid-year correction, feedback, and refinement of the implementation process.

Finally, for the enhancement of school/community relationships, a systematic instructional parenting model was designed and implemented. This model provides a variety of educational experiences for parents in the areas of parenting training, school curricula, volunteerism, and monitoring student achievement at home.

The following is a description of the involvement in the program by the district's central office, the school board, the State education

agency, the teachers' union, outside agencies or consultants, parents, principals, and teachers:

- *Central office personnel provide general assistance in the form of half-day meetings for principals and staff five times a year.*
- *Central office supervisory personnel provide assistance in curriculum development, staff inservice training, and strategy development for effective teaching.*
- *A SIP coordinating team, which includes six supervisory instructional specialists, one special education supervisor, and the project director, provides overall direction.*
- *Faculty members in educational research from the University of Pittsburgh and Duquesne University provide assistance in planning, documentation, and program development.*
- *Chapter 1 personnel provide assistance to teachers, at-risk student, and parents.*
- *The SIP, previously assigned to only individual elementary schools, has been authorized by the superintendent and the board to include middle and high school[s] in the project.*
- *Pennsylvania State Board of Education has officially sanctioned the overall school improvement plan for the Pittsburgh school district.*
- *Building level instructional cabinets, a collaborative problem solving mechanism, provide for teacher involvement and shared professional decisionmaking around the issues of school improvement.*
- *The Pittsburgh Teacher Professionalism Project, a union sponsored initiative, provides an ongoing opportunity for teachers and administrators to work together to advance and improve the education of all students.*

Cost

The School Improvement Project has a current operating annual budget of $482,659.00. The source of funding derives from the general school operating budget. There are no outside sources of funding to operate the project.

Characteristics of the District

In 1987-88, the Pittsburgh Public School District enrolled 17,116 students (average daily attendance—ADA) in 47 elementary schools (grades K-5) for an average ADA per elementary schools of 364. The average class size at this level was 23 students. Nearly 54 percent of the elementary students received free school lunches.

At the middle school level (grades 6-8), Pittsburgh had 14 schools with an ADA of 6,679 students. The average ADA per middle school was 477. Average class size was 20 students. The percentage of middle school students receiving free school lunches was 55 percent.

The school system had 12 high schools (grades 9-12) with a total ADA of 10,176 students. The average ADA per high school was 848 students and average class size was approximately 24 students. The percentage of students receiving free school lunches was 29 percent at the high school level. The annual high school dropout rate was 7.4 percent.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

Nine of the system's schools participate in the School Improvement Project—7 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 1 high school. The 7 elementary schools had a average ADA of 427 students (average for all elementary schools was 364) and an average class size of slightly more than 22 students (average of all elementary schools was 23). About 65 percent of the students enrolled in participating elementary schools received free school lunches (some 54 percent of all elementary students in the system received free lunches).

The participating middle school had an ADA of 611 students (the average for all middle schools was 477) and an average academic class size of approximately 19 students (average for all middle schools was 20). Nearly 66 percent of the students received free school lunches (average for all middle school students was 55 percent).

The participating high school had an ADA of 996 students (average ADA for all high schools was 848) and an average class size of nearly 25 students (average of all high schools was approximately 24). Thirty-three percent of the students received free school lunches (29 percent of all high school students in the system did so). The participating high school's annual dropout rate was 7.0 percent (system dropout rate was 7.4 percent).

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND

Characteristics to be Achieved

The Prince George's County school district identifies the following characteristics as those it is seeking to achieve under its Effective Schools program:

- *clear and focused mission*
- *climate of high expectations for success for all students*
- *strong instructional leadership*
- *opportunities to learn and student time on learning*
- *frequent monitoring of student progress*
- *safe and orderly environment*
- *positive home-school relations*

Overall Goals

The school system has set the following academic improvement goals for schools under the program:

- *standardized test scores . . . will show increases in the percentages of students within the upper quartile, and annual decreases in the percentage of students in the lower quartiles*
- *functional test scores [on the State of Maryland's high school competency tests] . . . will show annual increases in the percentage of students at grades nine and ten who reach or exceed the criterion for mastery*
- *the gap between achievement scores for black and non-black students will diminish annually, while achievement scores for all students will increase*
- *criterion referenced test scores will show annual increases in the percentage of students at each grade level who attain essential objectives*
- *the percentage of student attendance will increase annually*

Indicators of Success

As the program goals indicate (see above), the county is using various tests to measure the success of the program. These include the California Achievement Test and State of Maryland high school competency tests. Students must pass 4 State competency tests as a condition for graduation. Test taking can begin in the 9th grade. In addition, the program's success is being measured by data gathered by Effective Schools Audit Advisory Teams (see below). Indicators that these Teams use include extent of staff awareness of the research and process for developing effective schools and the degree of staff involvement in creating School Improvement Plans (see below).

The county school system reports that it is meeting its goals. Among the results provided to the Committee are the following:

- *Student achievement in Prince George's County Public Schools has continued to improve, nearing the fourth, or highest quartile on standardized achievement measures and reaching or exceeding state averages on high school competency exams. Criterion referenced test results show steady gains in the number of students who demonstrate mastery of essential objectives.*
- *During the 1987-88 school year, third grade students . . . moved into the top 30 percent nationally on the California Achievement Test by scoring at the 73rd percentile—the first time any grade in the school system has surpassed the 70th percentile on the total exam. Students in grade five reached the 69th percentile and those in grade eight reached the 67th percentile.*
- *Black students in grades three and five entered the top 40 percent nationally by exceeding the 60th percentile on the test for the first time. Black third graders scored at the 66th percentile while black fifth graders reached the 61st percentile. Black eighth graders system-wide scored at the 58th percentile.*
- Between 1985-86 and 1987-88, black and white students in Prince George's County were increasingly likely to pass the State of Maryland high school competency tests. On the Citizenship Skills test, black 9th graders went from a 55 percent passing rate to 67 percent while whites increased their passing rate from 75 percent to 80 percent. On the Mathematics Test, black 9th graders improved their passing rate from 43 percent to 56 percent; whites went from 68 percent to 79 percent. On the Reading Test, the black rates went from 88 percent to 91 percent; the white rates rose by a percentage point from 96 percent to 97 percent. Finally, on the Writing Test, blacks passed at an 89 percent rate in 1987-88, up from 41 percent in 1984-85. Whites went from 59 percent to 95 percent.

Implementation

The Effective Schools Process is a total school system commitment. Therefore, participation in the process is required for all schools, all school-based staff, and all non-school based staff. A system-wide Effective Schools Steering Committee provides input to the Superintendent of Schools for implementation of the process.

The Steering Committee is composed of central office staff, principals, teachers, and parents.

The effective schools program was initially implemented through workshops and retreats conducted for all principals in the school system. Effective schools researcher Larry Lezotte provided inservice assistance for the principals. Each school designed its own inservice plan for its personnel during teacher inservice days. At the outset, the central office provided inservice training in effective schools for 7 early-closing days. Since then, the inservice days have been reduced to 4.

The school system has created a process of monitoring the implementation of the program through school site visits by Effective Schools Audit Advisory Teams. Each Team is chaired by a princi-

pal and composed of classroom teachers and a central or area office representative.

The Team spends one day in a school, interviewing the principal and staff, visiting classrooms and reviewing data. The Team prepares an audit report which gives feedback to the principal and staff [of the audited school]. Problem areas are identified and a plan to address these areas is developed by the principal and School Improvement Team [see below]. The Teams report on the level of staff awareness of the Effective Schools Process and research; the degree of involvement staff members felt they had in developing their school's Improvement Plans [see below]; and the extent to which staff members felt they were actively participating in the implementation of the process.

Each school has established a School Improvement Team characterized by shared decision making. The Team is involved in the preparation of its school's Improvement Plan which delineates the school-based initiatives that will be carried out to implement the Effective Schools program.

COST

Costs for implementing the effective schools process have occurred in the following areas:

1. Staff Development for principals, central office personnel and teachers. These costs have included consultant fees, videotapes, printing, substitute coverage, publications, and conference attendance.

2. Criterion Referenced Test Development for frequent monitoring of student progress. These costs have included development of curriculum objectives and test items, item bank procurement, test development software, printing, scanning equipment, and part-time salaries.

Approximately 90% of the cost incurred in implementing the Effective Schools process have been covered through the regular school system budget funded by local government sources. The remaining costs, primarily for administrators' training, have come from business and industry support and grants from private agencies.

Although staff development costs have been reduced by conducting local school in-service on "early closing" staff development days, this is the largest single need for additional support.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DISTRICT

The Prince George's County, Maryland school district is the 16th largest in the nation with 103,500 enrolled students. It has 171 schools, including 114 elementary schools, 26 middle schools, and 20 high schools. At the beginning of the 1988-89 school year, 44 of the system's schools were "magnet schools"—schools with features designed specifically to attract voluntarily a racially and ethnically diverse student body.

Of the school system's enrollment, 63 percent are black, 31 percent are white, 4 percent are Asian, 2 percent are Hispanic, and .1 percent are American Indian. Of the 5,600 teachers, 29 percent are black.

Twenty-two percent of the student enrollment are receiving free or reduced price lunches.

The average pupil/teacher ratio is 21.7 to 1 for kindergarten, 26.4 to 1 for elementary grades, 24.8 to 1 for middle school grades, and 25.2 to 1 for high school grades.

The school system's average per pupil expenditure is $4,155.

The school system reports a high school (grades 9 to 12) dropout rate of 5.01 percent.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM

All schools are participating in the effective schools program (see characteristics described above).

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

(County Office of Education)

Characteristics to be Achieved

All of the characteristics identified by the Effective Schools research are assessed as part of the San Diego County School Effectiveness assessment process. In addition to the five listed,[1] *the assessment also addresses home-school relations and opportunity to learn/time on task.*

. . . Over 150 schools in San Diego County have used the assessment instruments to build the data base on which their school improvement plans are based. The areas chosen for focus will vary from year to year based on the needs assessment results. Schools that are also participating in the California School Improvement Program must develop improvement plans in the various content areas and as well as schoolwide issues such as leadership, safe and orderly school climate.

. . . The San Diego County Office of Education's Effective Schools Program utilizes a wide variety of assessment instruments and procedures to give each school a comprehensive look at itself. Undertaking an Effective Schools program requires a school staff to have the courage to engage in an open and comprehensive self-evaluation of its current practices and attitudes. The instructional leadership skills of the principal, in particular, are singled out for review in the process. Once the data are collected and shared with school personnel, areas of need emerge. Potential activities for improvement arise.

Overall Goals

The program goals of the San Diego County School Effectiveness Program are to help school conduct a needs assessment that is based on the Effective School correlates and to analyze disaggregated test data in order to develop an improvement plan that will raise overall achievement and narrow the gap between students from different ethnic, economic, or educational backgrounds. In the early years of the program, improving school climate or student behavior was often a first priority of the school, but was not one of the explicit goals of the program. [In 1988,] a new phase of the school effectiveness program was launched, the High Performance Schools Project, and additional outcome measures were identified and have been incorporated into school improvement plans in the 15 project schools.

. . .

[1] See the description of the Federal Effective Schools legislation in the Introduction.

It should be noted that the San Diego County Office of Education is an intermediate unit between the state and local school districts and does not have direct control over the 43 local school districts in the county. Schools that have participated in the program have done so voluntarily; therefore specific goals have varied from school to school depending on the level of commitment and involvement of the principal and staff at each individual site. The High Performance Schools Project initiated in the spring of 1988 represents a more focused and targeted effort to provide assistance to school that has resulted in more extensive data collection and follow through to see that improvement plans are implemented. Each school must set both overall achievement goals and goals that will help to narrow the gap among different groups of students.

Indicators of Success

The primary indicator of program progress is test results, especially disaggregated results for third and sixth grade students as reported through the California Assessment Program (CAP). Through the Effective Schools Program, schools have also used the Effective Schools instruments to assess progress. Given the large number of schools that requested county services and the limited staff, it has not been possible to track progress of all schools, especially tracking disaggregated results. Schools that are committed to the Effective Schools process are monitoring their own progress and annually use test results to set their improvement goals. Other schools have conducted an initial Effective Schools assessment, but have not followed through. It is important to note that among the districts in San Diego County there exists friendly competition with each one working hard to help students achieve. Overall, the schools in the county continue to score above state averages on statewide tests, and at the same time student enrollments have come increasingly from minority and low income families making it imperative that schools find strategies to help all students succeed.

Staff of the Effective Schools program have monitored progress through an in depth study of ten schools that participated in the initial Effective Schools program. In this study a rigorous definition of school effectiveness was used: the school had to have increased overall achievement, decreased the number of students scoring in the bottom quartile, and have students in the two lowest socioeconomic categories out-scoring their counterparts in the state to be called an Effective School. The study showed mixed results: four of the schools met the equity definition, three had made important student gains but did not quite meet the criteria, and three schools remained ineffective. Interviews were conducted with staff members to find out why some schools were improving and others were not. The study showed that the schools that had become effective had made important changes in their institutional program, in the way the school was organized, and in the climate and culture of the school. Particularly important was a shift in attitudes to believing that all children could learn basic skills and that the teachers were capable of accomplishing this goal.

In 1988 a case study has also been written about one school that had participated in the Effective Schools program for two years.

This case study will be printed in a volume to be released by the National Center of Effective Schools [Okemas, Michigan 48864]. . . .

The new High Performance School Project has developed a report card that will increase the monitoring of progress in the 27 performance indicators that have been identified, e.g. test scores, dropouts, attendance, college admissions, vandalism, etc. [see following list]. One goal of the project is to develop a computer program so that each school can more easily enter and retrieve data to monitor its own progress.

Performance Indicators

The High Performance Schools (HPS) Project has targeted 27 elements reflecting students performance. Each school's planning team will select specific performance indicators as targets for improved student achievement.

1. **CAP/CAS[3]** - In effective schools ALL students, regardless of socioeconomic level, ethnicity, or language proficiency will achieve basic skill proficiency.

2. **PSAT/SAT[9]** - By increasing the number of students taking the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) and focusing on skills assessed on the SAT, improved student performance on academic measures for college readiness can be attained.

3. **Golden State Examinations[9]** - Project schools will be encouraged to use the Golden State Exams as end-of-course tests. County Office of Education scoring service will be provided.

4. **Advanced Placement[9]** - Both the number of advanced placement course offerings and the number of students passing AP tests with a score of 3 or greater will be increased.

5. **CAP Writing[9]** - The number of students scoring 4 or greater on the CAP Direct Assessment of Student Writing (Autobiographical incident, Evaluation, Problem Solution, and Report of Information) will be significantly increased.

6. **Basic Skills Proficiency** - Basic skill proficiency at appropriate benchmark grade levels will be attained by students.

7. **Presidential Academic Fitness Award** - The number of students attaining a GPA of 3.3 or greater or scoring "at or above" the 80th percentile level on the school's standardized achievement tests will be increased.

8. **Student Promotion/Retention** - Safeguards and regular education interventions will be implemented in order to reduce the number of students retained at their present grade level due to academic failure or insufficient unit credit.

9. **College Writing Standards[9]** - The percentage of students meeting college entrance writing standards will be increased.

10. **Student Self-Esteem** - Improved student self-perceptions and feelings about school, classwork and teachers will be attained.

11. **Student Attendance** - A reduction in the number of unexcused student absences will be attained through a planned incentive approach.

12. **Student Drop-Out Rates[9]** - A planned approach to reducing the number of students leaving school with no evidence of re-enrolling in the same school or another school within 45 school days will be developed in selected schools.

13. **Student Suspension/Expulsion Rates** - Schoolwide disciplinary plans will be refined to expand the number of alternatives to traditional suspensions.

14. **Student Discipline** - The number of disciplinary referrals in HPS project schools will be reduced by developing a schoolwide discipline plan that is supported by the entire school staff.

15. **Extracurricular Activities[9]** - The relationship between extracurricular participation and improved academic performance will be enhanced in HPS schools.

16. **Vandalism** - The annual incidents of vandalism and total dollar value of repairs attributable to vandalism will be reduced.

17. **Graduating Senior Attitudes[9]** - Senior Exit Surveys of student attitudes towards the quality of their high school education will be conducted.

18. **Drug and Alcohol Use** - Project schools are eligible to receive an annual assessment of student drug and alcohol use in their student populations.

19. **Quality and Quantity Student Homework** - The frequency and quality of homework assignments will be improved.

20. **Student Employment[9]** - An assessment of the impact of student employment on academic achievement will be conducted.

21. **Physical Fitness** - The number of students meeting the state and federal standards for physical fitness will be increased.

22. **College/University Admissions[9]** - The percentage of graduates entering the colleges and universities will increase. A proportionate number of graduates representing each school's ethnic distribution will also be reflected in college admissions.

23. **College/University Scholarships[9]** - The number of scholarships awarded to graduates will increase.

24. **Career Objectives[9]** - An analysis of career plans for high school graduates and their job preparedness will be completed. Such resources as the ROP Job Search Video training will be provided upon request.

25. **Staff Efficacy/Organizational Health** - School climate and organizational health will be enhanced to improve the learning environment for students.

26. **Staff Attendance** - Incentives for improved staff attendance will be developed, implemented, and evaluated.

27. **Parent Involvement** - To assess current levels of parent involvement and plan strategies that link home and school in ways that will enhance student achievement.

[9] Apply to secondary schools only.

Implementation

Participation in the San Diego County School Effectiveness Program is voluntary. In general, individual schools have contacted the county office and asked for assistance. A presentation is made to the principal to explain the assessment and planning process. The principal is singled out on the surveys through the instructional leadership component and because the principal's responses are reported separately from the staff's. Therefore, it is important for the principal to agree to the process first before a presentation is made to the whole staff. If the staff agrees, usually by consensus, occasionally by a vote, the process is begun. The first step is forming a planning team and conducting the Effective Schools assessments which are usually completed by the entire staff, by a random sample of parents, and at the secondary level by students. Test data are analyzed and data on other performance indicators are collected. The planning team then works with a consultant from the County Office who assists them in developing an action plan based on the assessment data. Some planning teams have actively involved parents. In other cases parents have been informed and input received through the surveys, but they have not been involved in the planning and implementation process.

The involvement from district staff has varied from district to district. In some districts, once school needs were identified, there were district resources that the school could turn to for help. In other cases, the district was providing resources (e.g. staff development) but it did not always mesh with school needs creating tension and confusion.

Working with district staff is probably one area that was neglected by the county office. As the staff has worked with schools over time, it has become obvious that more attention needs to be paid to district roles and leadership. Current efforts have involved the districts in two ways. First, all schools and their districts participating in the High Performance Schools project are required to sign a memorandum of understanding that they will provide support and that project efforts will supplement not supplant district improvement efforts.[1] Second, the project is working with one entire district and its six schools to see if this approach has more impact than working with a school or two in a district.

Cost

In the first four years of operation, the county office provided support for the program through its general fund by supporting two to four positions for staff members who worked with schools. It costs approximately $1500 to $2000 per school to conduct the needs assessments and assist with planning and implementation. However, these services were provided free of charge as part of the regular county office services to schools. Most of the schools utilizing the county office's Effective School assessment process have funds to assist with implementation of improvement plans. These funds come from the California School Improvement Program, state compensa-

[1] A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement is provided below at the end of this section on the San Diego program.

tory education funds, [Federal] Chapter 1 funds, and [Federal] Chapter VII bilingual education funds. It is difficult to assess per pupil costs or annual funding required because of the nature of the program and the relation of the county office to district schools. It is important to note that additional funds were not allocated for this program in the first five years of operation. Instead, existing staff time was reallocated. Similarly the schools that participated did not receive additional resources. It is interesting to note that the schools that made the greatest gains were those that reallocated their existing resources to address identified needs.

New financial resources have been allocated for the High Performance Schools Project by the county office. The additional funds ($188,500) have come from California state lottery funds allocated to the county office. These funds are being used to provide release time for teachers to engage in planning to attend staff development activities. In addition, six staff members and three clerical positions are funded at a total cost of $495,516 and have been assigned to work with project schools. The intent of the three year project is to not only provide assistance to the project schools that results in improved student achievement, but also to develop systems and models that can be replicated by other schools in the county in future years.

Characteristics of the District

The San Diego County Office of Education works with 43 school districts enrolling 361,740 students. According to the County Office, *These district vary a great deal in size, ethnic make-up, number of children on AFDC or receiving free and reduced price lunches.* The county school systems' student enrollment is 57.3 percent white, 23.2 percent Hispanic, 8.3 percent black, 5.5 percent Asian, 5.0 percent Filipino, and .6 percent American Indian.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

The schools that have used the San Diego County Effective Schools Surveys and other resources are reflective of the diversity of the county's student populations reported above. The school currently participating in the High Performance Schools Project are equally diverse.

San Diego County Office of Education

and

_____

District

Memorandum of Agreement
High Performance Schools Project

SECTION I

Statement of Intent

WHEREAS we believe that ALL students should be enabled to achieve academic excellence and social-emotional well-being in appropriate educational settings; and

WHEREAS we are committed to providing effective and high quality instructional support services to schools in order to assist them in ensuring student success; and

WHEREAS we believe that the school site, operating within the district framework and guidelines, is an appropriate place where decisions, planning, and program implementation can result in increased accountability for improved student outcomes; and

WHEREAS we believe that the High Performance Schools Project, hereafter referred to HPS, is an appropriate vehicle for facilitating the delivery of quality services to schools;

NOW, therefore, the parties agree to the following:

SECTION II

San Diego County Office of Education Commitment

The High Performance Schools Project of the San Diego County Office of Education will:

1. Provide assistance in conducting a thorough assessment of current school conditions.

2. Provide technical assistance and support to a school planning team in analyzing baseline data, identifying targets for improvement, and developing an improvement plan.

3. Provide staff development programs directed toward the targets for improvement.

4. Provide timely access to student and school information necessary for instructional management.

5. Develop a school report card to facilitate on-going analysis of student performance indicators that will be used to develop the school's annual report.

6. Provide funding, resources, and incentives that are germane to the individual school's improvement plan.

7. Link all schools that are participating in the HPS project and provide regular information regarding strategies and services.

8. Maintain and adhere to the articles of law, district policies and procedures, and contractual agreements that govern the operations of schools.

SECTION III

District Administrative Commitment

The District Administration will:

1. Provide support and assistance in the collection of school and district data as part of the needs assessment and improvement processes.

2. Provide release time or other alternative arrangements for selected school staff members to participate in the school improvement planning process and staff development programs.

3. Provide timely access to information and services in the areas of personnel, budget, and school management.

4. Work with the HPS staff and the school planning team to implement procedural changes that support the school improvement plan.

5. Plan with HPS staff ways to recognize and reward the attainment of student performance targets by project schools.

6. Assist the project schools(s) in sustaining and institutionalizing the improvement process.

7. Maintain district support in order to ensure that the HPS project supplements, not supplants, current effort.

Section IV

School Commitment

This section of the Memorandum of Agreement pertains to each school participating in the HPS project.

Each school in the HPS project agrees to do the following:

1. Establish and maintain a school improvement planning team or comparable committee.

2. Develop a school improvement plan that specifically delineates student outcomes and appropriate targets for improvement based on comprehensive assessment data.

3. Establish as a performance target "20 by 90" (i.e. a 20% improvement in student performance indicators by the year 1990).

4. Identify resources, provide release time, and organize staff efforts to accomplish the objectives that are included in the school's performance improvement plan.

5. Develop and publish an annual report reflecting student performance objectives, targets for improvement and instructional strategies.

6. In cooperation with the district and HPS staff, develop a school budget that reflects the school improvement plan.

7. Work with the HPS staff and appropriate school district administrators to implement procedural changes that support the improvement plan.

8. Focus school improvement strategies on both cognitive and affective performance factors.

SECTION V

Parties to the Agreement

In consideration of the spirit and intent of this Memorandum of Agreement, the following signatories confirm their understanding of and commitment to the principles and objectives embodied herein:

SIGNATURES:

Principal

By: _____
Authorized Signature

Date: _____

District Superintendent

By: _____
Authorized Signature

Date: _____

DISTRICT BOARD APPROVED: _____
Date

Superintendent of Schools
San Diego County Office of Education

By: _____

Date: _____

COUNTY BOARD APPROVED: _____
Date

SOUTH HARRISON, MISSOURI

Characteristics to be Achieved

South Harrison School District (Bethany, Missouri) has implemented a South Harrison Instructional Management System (IMS). Characteristics included from "effective schools studies" [are:]

1. All students can learn (mastery learning techniques). . . .

2. A focus on academic skills (teaching to specific "key skills" or learner outcome objectives).

3. Frequent monitoring of pupil and program progress (mastery learning; teach-test-reteach-retest; internal audit process).

4. Strong instructional leadership by principals and supervisors.

5. Parental involvement through communication they can understand.

6. Maintenance of a safe and orderly district and school climate.

Overall Goals

The South Harrison Instructional Management System was developed as a PK–12 improvement model to align and improve the scope and sequence of the "core competencies" (reading, language arts, mathematics, science and social studies) taught in the district.

We developed clear-cut key K–12 skills that are measured by local and state developed criterion reference[d] tests. It is important for the board of education, professional staff, students and parents to understand what students are doing well and the areas we need to concentrate district resources.

Establishing specific performance standards and evaluating our progress against these standards was key to improving our K–12 instructional program.

We believe the performance between lower achieving students and high achieving students could be narrowed. Deficits in student learning that accumulate over time could be abolished or reduced through a districtwide instructional management system.

We believe accountability of our system should be improved.

Indicators of Success

We targeted the measurement of K–12 learner objectives in the core competencies (reading, mathematics, language arts, science and social studies) and physical education. Through locally developed tests, objectives are evaluated against a district set mastery level. Record keeping is handled by instructional clerks that communicate

and store data on each district student. Principals, staff, students and parents are provided performance reports.

In the spring grades 2-10 are administered a Missouri Mastery Achievement Test (MMAT). These criterion reference tests are closely aligned to the district's learner objectives. MMATs are norm referenced to the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Utilizing local tests and the MMAT we validate what we are doing well and focus on the specific areas we need to improve.

South Harrison participates in the Voluntary Academic Achievement Program Pilot study developed by the Missouri State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The state board of education authorized the program to "indicate a school's effectiveness in teaching specific learning outcomes important to students' future success". Student test results on the MMAT are examined in two forms: (1) performance by grade and subject expressed in quantiles based on state wide data; and (2) average performance by subject expressed in scaled scores.

The South Harrison School District "achieved the standard for recognition" in the first year of the program during the 1987-88 school year.

To achieve this recognition a participating district must improve achievement in three of the four subjects (reading, language arts, mathematics, science and social studies) expressed in average scaled scores by a minimum of 11 scaled score points over the prior year's performance. South Harrison achieved four of the four subjects and improved performance by reducing the percentage of students in the lower quantiles.

Implementation

The South Harrison Instructional Management System is mandatory for the district. The board of education from 1984-87 identified the development of an instructional improvement and management [program] as one of the major goals of the school district. [A] [d]evelopment and implementation plan was developed by the professional staff and principals. The superintendent of schools coordinated the process and provided the identification of resources.

Recommendations for learner objectives, scope and sequence, and alignment, were presented by curriculum management committees to the board of education for review and approval.

State Department of Education personnel provided resources support for each district committee[.] [W]orkshops on "Effective Schools" were attended.

We found universities to be behind in assisting in turning "theory into practice".

Cost

Funding for the development and implementation of the South Harrison Instructional management System is through a combination of sources.

Local: 3 instructional clerks—operate computer for IMS record keeping system

$40000 per annum (1985-88)—substitutes, outside workshops, inservice, etc.

$8000.00—equipment and supplies, software
State: Free textbook fund—$40,000+ per annum 1985-88 purchase [of] resources to teach to objectives
1984-85 "Lighthouse Program"—no dollars but human [and] curriculum resources made available from State Department
Federal: Chapter 2 funds

Characteristics of the District

The South Harrison School District is comprised of a Junior-Senior High School for grades 7-12; two elementary schools for PK through 6 located in New Hampton and Bethany and a Vocational School which serves the North Central Area of Missouri.

Total (headcount) enrollment in the school district is 887 (average daily attendance is 748).

Thirty-five percent of the district's students receive a free school lunch.

The annual high school dropout rate is 1.5 percent.

The pupil/teacher ratio is 11 to 1.

The annual average per pupil expenditure is $3,418.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All of the district's schools are participating in the effective schools program.

SPENCERPORT, NEW YORK

Characteristics to be Achieved

The Spencerport Central Schools' program has the following characteristics as objectives:

- *safe and orderly environment*
- *clear school mission*
- *instructional leadership*
- *high expectations for success*
- *opportunity to learn and student time on task*
- *frequent monitoring of student progress*
- *[good] home-school relations*

Overall Goals

The Spencerport program has a Project Goal, a School Improvement Goal, and an Excellence Goal.

Project Goal—The project's goal for each building in the district is:

A. Ninety-five, or greater, percent of all students at each grade level should demonstrate minimum academic mastery. Students who achieve minimum academic mastery have been prepared so that they will be predictably successful in the next grade in either their own school district or in any other school district throughout the nation. Minimum academic mastery is measured by performance on a standardized achievement test (preferably criterion-referenced, otherwise norm-referenced).

B. There shall be no significant different in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socioeconomic class.

C. The above two conditions shall have been obtained for a minimum of three consecutive years.

School Improvement Goal—Should a school building not be effective according to the above goal [Project Goal], then the following criteria for school improvement are used until a building becomes effective:

A. There shall be an annual increase in the proportion of students who demonstrate minimum academic mastery, and

B. There shall be an annual decrease in the proportion of youth demonstrating minimum academic mastery as a function of socioeconomic class.

Excellence Goal—In addition to its main goal, the project also has an Excellence Goal. It is: the number of students with outstanding achievement will rise.

1. There shall be an annual [increase in] the percentage of students scoring in stanines seven, eight and nine on the Stan-

(52)

ford Achievement Test in Reading Comprehension and Total Mathematics or of the percentage of students scoring at or above 90% on a Regents examination.

2. For those subjects in which a significant proportion of the students take a Regents exam,

a. There will be an annual increase in the percentage of students scoring 65% or higher, and

b. There will be an annual increase in the percentage of students taking the exam.

INDICATORS OF SUCCESS

Assessment of the Spencerport's achievement of the Project Goal is based on a variety of tests taken by students throughout the system. These include performance on different elements of the Stanford Achievement Test, the New York State Preliminary Competency Test in Writing, selected Regents Exams, and the New York State Math Regents Competency Test.

When the Spencerport disaggregated analyses were studied, two categories of effectiveness [on the Project Goal] emerged. They are:

A. Effectiveness—95% or greater of both the lower SES group and the middle and upper SES groups attain minimum academic mastery.

B. Near Effectiveness—90% or greater of both the lower SES group and the middle and upper SES groups attain minimum academic mastery.

The Spencerport district has 5 schools (3 elementary schools, 1 junior high school, and 1 high school). Results were provided to the Committee for various subjects. For example, in mathematics, 4 of the schools have achieved "near effectiveness" on specific indicators. Two of these schools have achieved "effectiveness" on other math indicators. In science, the junior high and high schools have both achieved "near effectiveness" on specific indicators.

From analysis of the performance of the district on the School Improvement Goal, the district concludes that *we started with high proportions of the student body above minimum academic mastery and that these proportions improved, thus further substantiating the claim that the school improvement goal is being met.* For example, on reading comprehension, the 3 elementary schools and the junior high school showed improvement in the percent of students at or above the 40th percentile on reading from 1982-83 through 1987-88—rising from percentages that ranged between 71 and 87 percent in 1982-83 to a range of 83 to 95 percent in 1987-88. In mathematics, the 1982-83 range for these schools was 80 to 89 percent; while in 1987-88, the range was 92 to 96 percent.

On the Excellence Goal the school system found:

[W]e started with high proportions of the student body scoring in the top three stanines. Nevertheless the proportion increased in ten of twelve instances [4 schools and 3 different Stanford Achievement Test fields]. An analysis such as this, that is, of the proportion of students who obtain excellent scores, is not one which school systems normally develop. When we first did it, both teachers and administrators were surprised at the

number of students who did well! This motivated them to further improve their efforts!

Implementation

A. All schools, K–12, are required to participate.

B. The Central Office actively and enthusiastically supports the project. The Superintendent and/or the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction meet at least once a year with each Building Planning Team. The Superintendent annually approves all building plans for school improvement. The Assistant Superintendent serves as Project Director and prepares the annual evaluation report.

C. The Board of Education officially approved the Master Plan . . . which set forth the basic goals of the project. The Board annually receives and discusses the evaluation report for the project. Periodically the Board sponsors a dinner for Building Planning Team members in appreciation of their efforts.

D. The New York State Education Department . . . used Spencerport's program as a model for other school districts in the state [to] emulate. A recent survey showed that approximately 110 out of the 770 school systems in New York State are now embarked upon an Effective Schools project.

E. The Spencerport teachers union is officially represented on the project's district-wide Leadership Planning Team by either the Union President or his designee. Currently the Union President is a member of the committee.

F. Project consultants are Lawrence Lezotte and, until his untimely death, Ronald Edmonds.

In the district's publication Fifth Overview of the More Effective Schools/Teaching Project (November 1987), the implementation process is delineated as having had the following elements. Initially, awareness of the project was developed in building level faculties and specific leadership groups; a district level Leadership Planning Team received inservice training. This team in turn developed a Master Plan that was approved by the superintendent and board of education. A day was devoted to informing all faculty about the plan. A Building Planning Team was established for each school. Each team conducted an initial needs assessment for its school. This led to a regular, annual process of revising and developing new building level plans.

Cost

The source of funding for the effective schools project is the school district budget. It is not supported by outside funding. The total budget for 1988–89 is $23,240. On a per pupil basis this is $6.99.

It should be noted that summer curriculum and staff development funds which were in the budget prior to the start of the project and are now used to help achieve project objectives are not in the above figure. That figure represents new money needed to support the project.

Characteristics of the District

The Spencerport district has 5 schools—3 with grades K to 6; 1 for grades 7-9; and 1 for grades 10-12. The 1987-88 headcount enrollment was 3,322 (average daily attendance was 95.7 percent of that figure).

Minority students make up 4.1 percent of the total enrollment.

Free lunches are received by 3.5 percent of the enrollment.

The annual dropout rate is 3.8 percent.

The average pupil/teacher ratio is 24 to 1.

The average per pupil expenditure for the system is $5,576.95.

Characteristics of Schools Participating in the Program

All schools in the district are participating in the effective schools program.

○

26-758 (64)